

1963

12553

This was certainly true of HJALMAR NYGAARD. I do know that I will always value and cherish his memory. There were facets to his character. He was highly capable and he approached his job here in the Congress as one of opportunity and duty and service instead of some just due he deserved. He was a man of subtle humor, kindness, consideration, thoughtfulness, and understanding. He was a wonderful Christian.

I will miss HJALMAR NYGAARD as I know all of his many friends will miss him. We have lost a dear friend and the sudden news of the loss increases the sadness and the sense of the depth of loss. But I am thankful for his memory and I extend my sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I remember well that HJALMAR NYGAARD was the first new Member of the 87th Congress whom I happened to meet after arriving here in Washington, when I also was a new Member. I had a very special feeling for Congressman NYGAARD, perhaps for that reason. I remember well the lively, pleasant twinkle in his eyes as he spelled his first name and said, "Just forget that H."

It always seemed to me he was a salt-of-the-earth type of man, and definitely a product of the great American Midwest at its best.

He was a quiet, unassuming man. But when he talked, it was worthwhile listening, because his ideas were good, his thinking was sound, he was forceful and well informed in his beliefs.

HJALMAR was a teacher and a scholar, and every inch a courteous gentleman.

He was not only successful and respected in his private business life, he was most useful and effective in his community leadership and as an elected public servant with a very long and distinguished record of accomplishment at the local, State, and National levels of government.

I was not privileged to serve on the Interior Committee with HJALMAR NYGAARD, but I know well his reputation for hard, conscientious, productive service on that committee.

I was privileged frequently to ask his personal advice and opinion on legislative matters, and I greatly valued always what he had to say. In a quiet forceful manner he knew what he was talking about.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it came as a very great personal shock to me when I learned of Congressman NYGAARD's sudden death last Thursday. It is a very great tragic loss, not only to the members of his own family, but for his constituents, our Republican Party and for all Members of this 88th Congress.

All of us are the better for having had the honor of associating with him. All of us will miss him greatly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, HJALMAR NYGAARD was an earnest, experienced legislator, completely faithful to his convictions. I am privileged to have had the opportunity to know him and to be associated with him in the Congress.

Although firm in the application of principle to the conduct of public affairs, HJALMAR was a kindly man and his friends were many as evidenced here this

afternoon. His untimely death is a genuine loss to North Dakota and the Nation.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and their daughter.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and accomplishments of our late colleague, HJALMAR NYGAARD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MILLER of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930 TO REQUIRE CERTAIN NEW PACK- AGES OF IMPORTED ARTICLES TO BE MARKED TO INDICATE COUN- TRY OF ORIGIN

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, O'BRIEN of Illinois, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and BAKER.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may have until Friday midnight to file a report on the bill H.R. 7500.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL RIVER BASIN

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7638) to authorize additional appropriations for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL]?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I say this bill has been approved unanimously on our side and meets with the approval of the leadership on this side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$6,400,000 for the continuation of construction of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin approved in the act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE RAILROAD SITUATION

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have written today to the representatives of the railroad industry asking them to delay their institution of work rules next Tuesday until action is taken on legislation now pending in Congress.

Precipitate action on a matter so grave is hardly conducive to the proper consideration of the proposals presented to Congress.

We are tampering with the American institution of collective bargaining. This means of resolving labor disputes should not be dealt with lightly nor in a hostile or emotional atmosphere.

I am not passing judgment on the reason for, or the value of, the intended legislation when I express my opinion that Congress should be permitted to work its will on this matter, which affects the entire Nation, without having to work under the pressure of unreasonable deadlines or under the pressure of a nationwide strike which will arouse emotions and passions to the detriment of reason.

EXPROPRIATION OF U.S. EMBASSY BY CASTRO

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I read today that the Castro government has expropriated the U.S. Embassy building, and grounds, and furniture, and the Embassy home in a move believed unprecedented in diplomatic history. While we are negotiating a nuclear test ban with Russia supposedly in good faith, Khrushchev's puppet regime in Cuba is expropriating U.S. Embassy property valued at about \$2 million.

This further open, notorious, and purposeful slap in the face of our Government by Khrushchev's puppet government in Cuba, particularly at this time, casts a serious doubt on the good faith of Khrushchev in the Moscow negotiations today. I think it is time that the administration took steps to bring an end to these indignities by this Communist satellite that is subverting this hemisphere and dealing serious body blows

to our prestige throughout the world. It is time we take action, particularly in the face of this latest slap in the face, to institute a meaningful economic and political quarantine of Cuba, insisting that all free nations stop doing business with Castro and use Federal aid to accomplish this; withholding Alliance for Progress funds to any Latin American nation doing business with or continuing to recognize Castro's Communist government and denying the use of U.S. harbors to any country permitting ships under its flags or registries to trade with Cuba, and requesting the OAS backing for such a program. It is about time such action was taken.

THE RAILROAD WORK-RULES DISPUTE

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, today, with several other Members, I have introduced a bill to provide a means for settling the railroad work-rules dispute, for preventing such disputes, and to require aid to employees displaced by work-rule changes. The measure would adopt the approach used previously and with success to eliminate musician featherbedding in connection with the radio broadcasting industry. It would also specifically adopt the generous recommendations of the President's Emergency Board which reported in May with regard to recommendations to assist employees affected by change in work rules.

Such legislation has become necessary because the President's message to the Congress, and the joint resolution introduced pursuant to that message, amounts to nothing more than compulsory arbitration and passing the buck until after the 1964 election. The adoption of the administration's resolution seems sure to weaken rather than strengthen the collective bargaining processes in the transportation and, perhaps, as a precedent, in all industries. It is important that Congress deliberate with care and then enact clear and fair procedures for dealing with labor disputes in the transportation industry or any other industry affecting our national interest. The President's expectation that the Congress, should, within a week, attempt to come up with a solution for a problem that the administration has failed to solve in a period of 9 months, is ridiculous. Under circumstances, it should be up to the President to work out some arrangement for delaying the possible disastrous effects of a rail strike on our economy while Congress is given a reasonable period to study and propose its solutions.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 441 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7195) to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 441 provides for consideration of H.R. 7195, a bill to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal aid highway systems. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 7195 amends various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal aid highway systems. These amendments include a minor change in the formula of the apportionment of urban funds; a new date for the submission of Interstate System cost estimates to the Congress; elimination of the 1975 interstate "design date" restriction, substituting therefor a requirement that the interstate design be based on 20-year traffic projections; and an extension from June 30, 1963, until June 30, 1965, of the period during which a State may enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Commerce relating to advertising along the Interstate System.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 441.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer] in requesting the House to adopt this rule which makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 7195, which is a bill to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal aid highway systems.

Primarily this bill is designed to bring up to date in the next 2 or 3 years the various provisions of the Federal Highway Act. The bill was reported out of the House Committee on Public Works unanimously. The rule was reported out of the Committee on Rules unanimously. I know of no opposition to the measure itself or to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7195) to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal aid highway systems.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7195 with Mr. ULLMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7195 makes certain amendments to title 23 of the United States Code, which are necessary to provide for more effective operation of the Federal aid highway program.

H.R. 7195 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works after full and complete hearings. There are four sections to H.R. 7195, and these sections provide as follows:

Section 2 of the bill amends paragraph (3) of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code, by eliminating a special provision applicable to the two States of Vermont and Connecticut, in the apportionment of urban highway funds. This change was recommended by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the General Accounting Office. Under the present law, which has been in existence since the Federal Highway Act of 1944, Connecticut and Vermont towns are considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status for the apportionment of Federal-aid urban funds. The census conditions which originally supported this position no longer exist. Consequently, Connecticut and Vermont are receiving special treatment by having the population of these towns counted twice for apportionment of both secondary funds and urban funds. Connecticut and Vermont have received more in the apportionment of urban funds than they would have received if they were treated in the same manner as all other States. This section will provide for uniform treatment of all States in the apportionment of Federal-aid urban highway funds.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I would like to clear up this problem of Connecticut. It has caused considerable question to some of us. If we did not have this special treatment of Connecticut and Vermont heretofore, it is not correct to say, is it, that they would be treated as the other States, but rather that they would be treated in a detrimental fashion as compared to other States. Because of that fact, in the past they were given that special treatment. Is that not correct?

Mr. FALLON. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GIAIMO. As I understand it, there was a problem because of the nature of the political subdivisions in the New England States, particularly Vermont and Connecticut, whereby the

1963

the number of countries sending ambassadors to our country virtually doubled.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I commend the Senator for his statement, in which I joint wholeheartedly. Two years ago I joined in sponsoring a bill for the purpose stated. This year I filed a statement with relation to it.

A chancery is essentially a business office. To permit a business office, whether it be that of a foreign government or an office building of one of our own citizens, to come into a residential district would change completely the character of that district. As one who many years ago in Massachusetts worked very hard to enact a law on a similar subject, I know that the essence of a zoning law is to maintain and stabilize the district in which there are residences because by doing so such laws help to insure that the area will be a good one in which to bring up a family free from the excessive traffic and inconveniences which may result when the character of the area is changed by permitting businesses to operate in the midst of such areas.

Essentially the bill would place a chancellery, which is the business office of a foreign government, in the same status as a business office of an American citizen. It would permit the American citizen and the residence of the Ambassador to be in a residential district. I commend the District of Columbia Committee, under the leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] for making that point clear. I commend and join the Senator from Arkansas in making the effort to stabilize the residential districts of Washington, D.C.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, before making an explanatory statement with respect to the bill I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Does the Senator from Nebraska yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say to my colleagues that there is no more able Member of the Senate than the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who is about to address himself to a matter of supreme importance to the people of the United States. That concerns the continuing Communist cancer in this hemisphere.

I think all Senators will be extremely interested in reading or hearing what the Senator has to say. I rise on this occasion because I think Senators ought to be invited to come into the Chamber to listen to our colleague the Senator from Nebraska. Under those circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for that purpose?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor thereby, I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANTI-CASTRO FORCES WITHIN OCCUPIED CUBA: THE LEADERLESS RESISTANCE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, recently the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] made a major contribution both in focusing the firm purpose of the American people and then formulating effective national policy consistent with the popular will. With the vigorous support of many other Senators he has moved with courage and imagination to fill an urgent need in the forum of public debate and decision.

His proposal for Cuban liberation is simple and clear cut. It goes straight to the heart of this Nation's obligation, and its solemn pledge, to assist in the restoration of a free Cuba. Not eventually, but now. And not a so-called Titoist Cuba—in the image of that Communist regime's so-called independence of Moscow—but a Cuba that can once more fulfill its national destiny within the free world community.

He has proposed that we offer the use of our Guantanamo Naval Base as the seat of government for a provisional free Cuban regime—organized by the Cuban patriots themselves, established on their own soil, a rallying point for ultimate liberation from the Castro-Communist tyranny. To this proposal, my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has added the idea of a Pacific blockade, a complete quarantine, to seal off this Communist satellite from all external trade and traffic, except medicines and other emergency supplies for the Cuban people. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has called for a tough crackdown on all free world commerce with the Castro-Communist—by reminding the President of his statutory obligation to suspend all U.S. assistance to those nations still dealing with Castro or, if he has not done so, to tell the Congress his specific reasons why.

The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] has also joined in this mounting demand for action: he has directly and devastatingly challenged the administration's contention that Cuba no longer poses a clear and acute menace to free world security. Point-by-point and case-by-case, he has spelled out the grim details of a Cuban-based massive subversion campaign, aimed at every free government in the Americas.

These proposals, these calls for effective action, are no mere debater's points. Their purpose is not partisan; they are offered not as panceas but, rather, as spurs to debate and deliberation. The immediate goal is effective action. And the ultimate goal: the liberation of Cuba from Communist oppression.

The challenge contained in all these bold proposals is addressed, equally, to the disunited forces of free Cuba and to the timid officials of our own Government. Now, let us face facts: the disarray among anti-Castro Cubans has been shameful. It has reflected credit on no one—neither the Cuban patriots themselves nor those administration spokesmen whose endless vacillation and empty bombast have simply compounded the disarray. But the Allott proposal meets these facts head-on.

To the Cubans, it is a challenge to put aside their differences and to rally behind the goal of national liberation.

To the officials of this administration, it is a challenge to put aside their counsels of delay and despair and to make good their own pledges that Cuba must once more be free.

This proposal is a clear call to have done with endless but futile eloquence. In the broadest sense, it is a challenge to the whole Organization of American States community to get on with the vital task of ridding this hemisphere, once and for all, of the festering sore represented by the Soviet presence in Cuba and by a foreign-supported tyranny imposed on the Cuban people.

We have it on the word of the President himself—repeated as recently as July 17—that this Nation cannot continue, indefinitely, to coexist with a Communist satellite almost within sight of our own shores. On this overriding premise, then, "let us get moving." And here, in the form of the Allott proposal, is one way to begin.

It is a proposal, in its essence, aimed at making effective use of all those resources—of power, of fervor, and of patriotic purpose—that have been so shamefully wasted up to now in the sheer futility of our Cuba policy. Within the general framework of that proposal, it is my purpose today to center attention on one such wasted resource: the anti-Castro and anti-Communist ferment within occupied Cuba itself. I want to speak of what might be called the leaderless resistance to a foreign-bred, foreign-supported, and foreign-dominated tyranny.

Here we have, for the first time, a practical proposal for providing the necessary leadership to this resistance. Here is a way to capitalize on the overwhelming desire among Cubans for a rebirth of freedom and for an opportunity to pursue their own national destiny.

This undercurrent of resistance is explosive in its potential. And the existence, on Cuban soil, of a free Cuban provisional government might well provide the spark to light the fuse of ultimate and eventual liberation.

I repeat that this potential is explosive. We must be fully conscious, in our discussions and in raising the hopes

July 24

of the Cuban people for freedom, that we are indeed playing with fire. We are dealing in human lives. We must never forget our awful responsibility—not to raise these hopes too high too fast, nor to cause this resistance to surface only at the suicidal risk of reprisals by Castro's police. Let us, therefore, exercise great care and sober judgment in our deliberations. We must be fully prepared—morally and militarily—to back up any outbreaks or initiatives that we may help stimulate. Our hearts and voices and strong right arms must become one entity. This is a lesson that I would especially urge upon the spokesmen of this administration with their seemingly limitless powers of soaring eloquence—but whose powers of effective action seem to be frozen tight.

Let us, then, be prudent and painstaking. But let us not shrink from our clear obligations. Let us not continue to fritter away this matchless opportunity to hasten the collapse of Castro's vicious and unnatural tyranny. The resistance exists. It exists in the hearts of the Cuban people—and, more tangibly, in the Cuban hills. It is utterly dedicated to the overthrow of Castro-communism. It needs focus and direction—it must have leadership. And it must be spurred by the realistic hope that the march toward liberation has finally begun.

A unified all-party provisional government is the indispensable first step. Next must come a pledge of U.S. support—neither greater nor less than we are prepared to supply—made plain by the offer of a territorial base at Guantanamo. At this juncture, internal Cuban resistance can take on its true and vital significance.

Resistance is an easy word to throw around. It stirs the imagination. But let me say again that active resistance involves grave risk of life and the threat of terrible reprisals—and we must temper our discussion always with this sober awareness. We must never spur the people of Cuba to forms of action that we are not prepared to back up. But, equally, we must not forever lag behind them in our commitment to the cause of freedom.

We have already lived through an experience which is directly relevant to our present dilemma. We should, by now, have learned the lesson of the most deadly gap of all—the gap between words and deeds. This terrible lesson was played out, in October and November of 1956, in the streets of Budapest. I think it is just to say that the Hungarian freedom fighters were, equally, the victims of brutal Soviet suppression and of their own shattered hopes about their own ideas of the commitments they thought this Nation was prepared to fulfill. On the basis of such thoughts and their own interpretation of the facts, their hopes were falsely raised. But at the moment of cruel choice, they stood alone. And alone they shed their blood in the name of freedom.

I think, too, that I can speak of this lesson with a special intensity. My own racial stock affords me a particular understanding and depth of feeling for the plight of all captives of Communist tyranny—in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary,

in Poland, Yugoslavia, and all other captive nations throughout Eastern and Central Europe. I have talked with many Hungarian patriots. I have heard their stirring message at first hand by reason of my membership on the Internal Security Subcommittee. During the months of November and December, 1956, as well as the ensuing months in 1957, a series of hearings was held at which many witnesses, some of them having come to this country from the embattled streets of Budapest, described their experiences. It was heart rending to listen to their accounts of what actually happened and the terrible crime against humanity which the Communist overlords perpetrated.

And today, while considering the case of Cuba, we would do well to apply the lessons of occupied Europe to the needs of occupied Cuba.

So long as a single armed Soviet trooper remains in Cuba—whether we delude ourselves with the fiction that they are "technicians" or face squarely the fact of a full-scale Soviet occupation—so long as this Soviet presence remains, the threat of a Cuban Hungary is real and acute. The President has been unequivocal in his warning—we will not tolerate such a repetition of past history. There must be no second Hungary in this hemisphere.

If this warning is to mean anything, it must mean that we will not tolerate the suppression of any act of internal Cuban resistance by Soviet troops.

But if this is indeed the sense of the President's declaration, then I submit that he owes us answers to at least these two questions: first, what positive action has he undertaken to bring to an immediate end this blatant Soviet occupation of Cuba—and nothing short of this, I repeat, can possibly guarantee the prevention of a Cuban Hungary. And second, is the President aware of the mass of evidence, mounting day by day, that just such direct Soviet suppression of the internal anti-Castro resistance is already taking place?

What of the report, to cite one example, that on March 26 of this year, in the area of the Nicaro mines, a pitched battle with Soviet guards cost the resistance 4 dead and 12 captured—all of them summarily tried and executed, with a Soviet officer among their judges?

What of the repeated reports—wherever pockets of Cuban guerrillas hold out—that every skirmish involves not just Castro's Soviet-armed militia, but also the direct intervention of uniformed Russians?

And what of this quotation—published by Free Cuba News on June 22—from a Cuban police commander:

If there is a popular uprising here, we will employ the same tactics used in 1956 in Hungary. The only way to secure ourselves is through the use of absolute power.

Dare we speak of the threat of a Cuban Hungary? Rather, it may be necessary to face its reality—grim and present.

Evasion will not do. The American people, and their responsible representatives in the Congress, must have answers—clear and prompt. I call again on the President for authoritative information.

In this context and with full awareness of the stakes involved, what then do we mean by resistance? We do not mean open insurrection in the streets of Havana. That would represent only the last extreme step and could only succeed in tandem with massive external pressure, with force of arms. And that, I am sure, is not what the Senator from Colorado contemplated in his liberation proposal. Such a step, such a final commitment, could only be taken by the provisional government itself. And it could only be taken in close collaboration with the United States and the entire OAS community. It is a step we all pray will never have to be taken—not if other measures succeed.

Effective and purposeful internal resistance may mean, on the other hand, a great variety of acts, limited enough in particular, but massive in its totality: acts of passive resistance, industrial slowdowns, and deliberate low productivity in factories and farms; acts of vandalism and destruction of irreplaceable spare parts and machinery; acts especially of agricultural sabotage, in the cane fields and the sugar mills; wreckage of communications lines, roads, and rails; and the systematic spread of both information and misinformation—of rumors intended to disorganize the Castro regime and of truth which will undercut its pretensions and give the lie to its propaganda.

All this would constitute the resistance of a whole people. It would be massive proof of their distrust and disaffection, their hatred of a Communist puppet government which maintains itself only by virtue of Soviet arms. We have Castro's own testimony, added to that of his economic czar, of the tremendous cumulative impact of all such forms of economic sabotage.

Such concerted action may not, in and of itself, bring Castro to his knees. But it cannot fail to shake the very foundations of his Soviet-sponsored tyranny. And it may set the price of continued Soviet support so high—in terms of risks and resources and extended supply lines—that Moscow may think a second time, may even reappraise its long-term commitments. The lessons of last October—when we confronted Soviet power with bold and unswerving purpose—these lessons should not be lost on our own timid policymakers.

Internal resistance also means, of course, guerrilla and partisan forces—actively engaged in harassment and sabotage, and the nucleus on Cuban soil of the forces of ultimate liberation. Free Cubans throughout the hemisphere must maintain intimate liaison with this internal resistance. There must be close coordination of plans and action programs. There must be airdrops and covert landings of supplies and equipment.

There must be, most of all, a sense of common purpose and of unity throughout the free Cuban community. All this can only be provided by a unified provisional government—best of all, most inspiring of all, a provisional government established on Cuban soil. And that is the special genius of the Allott proposal for Cuban liberation.

1963

12505

A free Cuban government at Guantanamo would, I repeat and reemphasize, be the indispensable first step toward ultimate liberation. So, too, is the Colorado Senator's proposal a first step in yet another sense: a first step toward sober debate and then effective action by this Government. With every passing day, the Cuban base of world Communist imperialism becomes more hardened, more destructive of Cuba's social and economic fabric, tougher to dislodge. The Soviet presence remains—and grows. The entire hemisphere is under incessant attack, by the implacable agents of Communist subversion.

With every passing day, therefore, the menace grows. There is no more time to lose. Delay can only compound the deterioration of free world security. The time for decisive action is now.

And yet, Mr. President, although the urgency of the Cuban problem has been demonstrated beyond doubt, the administration apparently is not terribly concerned about Cuba. This complacent attitude, it seems to me, accounts for the administration's silence on the Allott proposal. The administration evidently prefers to put the damper on discussion of the Cuban situation. But, Mr. President, silence will not solve the problem. This problem and the set of circumstances which prevail in that unhappy island will not fade and disappear. The challenges posed by it will remain.

Mr. President, I feel that the Allott proposal deserves serious consideration by the administration. For this reason, I have dispatched a letter to the Secretary of State today, requesting his personal expression of the administration's official opinion of the Allott proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 24, 1963.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On June 17, on the floor of the Senate, Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, made an important statement in which he offered a proposal designed to bring about the liberation of Cuba from Communist rule. A copy of the Senator's statement is attached.

Senator ALLOTT urged all freedom-loving Cubans to bury personal rivalries and political differences and to unite behind the goal of liberating their homeland by forming a provisional all-party government. The sole function of this provisional government would be to channel and direct the efforts of the Cuban people to free themselves from the Communist yoke. As a spur to unity among the Cubans, the United States, under the Allott proposal, would pledge to them that upon the formation of a provisional all-party government, it would permit that government to establish its seat on Cuban territory at the U.S. Naval Station at Guantanamo Bay. As I understand the Senator's proposal, the effort to free Cuba from Communist rule will and should be carried out by the Cuban people primarily. But first there must be inspiration and direction to that effort, which can best be generated by the creation of a provisional government.

As you know, Senator ALLOTT served this country ably and faithfully last year as a U.S. delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. He made his proposal sob-

erly, with the hope that it would be debated on its merits in like fashion. Thus far, however, it has been greeted with virtual silence in the executive branch. To my knowledge, there has been no official statement of opinion on this proposal by the administration save only an informal reaction by the Department of State's press officer in response to reporters' questions on June 21.

In my opinion, Mr. Secretary, the Cuban situation is the most urgent problem in American foreign policy, and any serious proposals for coping with it merit serious consideration by the responsible officials of the executive branch. I invite your personal attention, therefore, to the Allott proposal, with the request that you give me your opinion of its merits.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senator, Nebraska.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his constructive remarks on the Cuban situation. More and more, as we proceed, we see an inclination on the part of the administration to continue the policy which it has followed for the past 2 years, of walking away from the Cuban question rather than meeting it. To date, no one in the administration has attempted to discuss the proposal I made, and on which I frankly asked for discussion and debate on the matter on the Senate floor. The only response has been the one by the senior Senator from Oregon. I believe that his response was more than adequately covered by a subsequent statement which I made.

I have in my hand—if the distinguished Senator will permit me to read it—a United Press dispatch, which reads as follows:

HAVANA.—The Castro government today expropriated the U.S. Embassy building and grounds in a move believed unprecedented in diplomatic history.

The action was taken in reprisal for the freezing of Cuban Government accounts in U.S. banks, according to the expropriation decree.

The decree was signed by Prime Minister Fidel Castro, President Osvaldo Dorticos, and Treasury Minister Luis Alvarez.

The Embassy has housed the Swiss Mission for American Affairs, beneath the Swiss flag, since the United States broke relations with Cuba on January 4, 1961.

The nationalization decree even specified that all the Embassy's "equipment and furniture have been assumed by the state."

The decree said "it is the duty of the revolutionary government of Cuba, in the maintenance of national dignity and sovereign rights of our people, to respond to the aggressions" of the United States.

The latest aggression was the bank freeze, the decree said.

The building on the Malecon Seawall Drive was modeled after the United Nations Secretariat Building in New York.

In view of the fact that one of the main contentions of the administration, or of its spokesmen from whom we have heard, is that we must maintain our diplomatic relations with Cuba, does the Senator see how we can possibly be worsening our relations in any way by encouraging the Cubans in exile to establish a provisional government, when the

Castro government itself has now seized our administration building?

Mr. HRUSKA. On the contrary, it would be my judgment that our position would be improved. A long time ago, the Castro regime cut off any practical diplomatic contact with the United States. This country has had to deal through the Swiss in Cuba. Now the Castro government has committed the unprecedented diplomatic affront of taking over the official residence of the U.S. Government in Havana. We may as well complete the story and have a provisional government installed at Guantanamo, pursuant to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], give recognition to it, and at the same time discontinue the nominal connection with Castro's government.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator may recall the statement of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that most of the people in America do not realize that the United States has not severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, but has only withdrawn our representative. I believe that if most Americans knew this, they would rise up in their wrath. But since we have not severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, what does the Senator from Nebraska think of the position in which this leaves us, when the Castro government has taken our embassy buildings in Cuba?

Mr. HRUSKA. The latest action of Castro's does not place the United States at a very high point of prestige in the world; and we are told that prestige is very important. It has not placed us in a very high position of prestige in the eyes of the family of nations.

Mr. ALLOTT. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has performed a real service in drawing a parallel with Hungary. I am sure he has had the experience, as I have had, of meeting and speaking with hundreds of exiles who have come from numerous Eastern European countries, including Hungary. We have had to give as our excuse for not acting in the Hungarian crisis that we had no way in which to act. That there was no practical, feasible way, militarily or otherwise, to support Hungary.

But such a reason cannot be advanced at this time for our not supporting the Cubans in exile in their attempt to take back their government, so that they can hold elections under their constitution, because it is not necessary to overfly antagonistic, hostile countries in order to help Cuba.

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no question about that; the Senator from Colorado has analyzed the situation accurately.

Mr. ALLOTT. Keeping in mind the attitude of millions of people throughout the world who are either now under the heel of communism or have escaped from Communist rule—and many hundreds of thousands are in this country who have escaped from the heel of communism—does the Senator from Nebraska see any way in which we can justify our action and still be considered the leader of the free world, when the present administration seemingly does not have the will to start the machinery which would help

the exiled Cubans to return to their own country?

Mr. HRUSKA. In answer to the Senator's question as to whether there is any way in which such inaction can be justified, I say that an attempt is being made to justify it. The administration and its apologists argue that any such course of action as that suggested by the Senator from Colorado would involve risk. There is no question about it. There would be a risk. There would be a grave risk. But the alternative must always be considered. The question is not whether a risk would be taken, but whether the risk of action would be greater than the alternative, which is a continuation of the present intolerable situation.

Mr. ALLOTT. A continuation of the subversion, sabotage, and disguised insurrection which is taking place in Cuba and throughout Latin America today, and which my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] described so well the other day.

Mr. HRUSKA. He described in dramatic detail the incidents of violence, guerrilla warfare, and subversion, and indicated that it is not only in the Castro pattern, but is conducted on a sustained basis, and that its force and effect are constantly growing, rather than diminishing.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have in my hand an article published in a recent issue of Newsweek, commenting on the requests of those of us who have been asking the administration to pay heed to this situation and come forth with their own plan, or even to tell us if the administration has a policy. The article indicates that we seem to be baffled by the indifference that is shown to the question, implying that the people are not interested.

I say to members of the other party and to the administration that if they think the people of the United States do not believe that Cuba is our primary foreign policy problem, they are badly out of step with the people of the United States. Everywhere I go I have found that this is the first question I am asked.

I can understand why the administration would be very glad to walk away from the problem of Cuba policy and to have the people talk about other things. I do not blame the administration, considering the failures they have experienced with respect to Cuba. It is understandable why the administration would hope that the American people will forget about the failures, and make every effort to help them forget. I wish particularly to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his remarks and especially for the parallel he has drawn between Cuba and Hungary, and his statement as to why we cannot again permit another Hungary to occur with respect to the people of Cuba.

Mr. HRUSKA. The mail received by my office does not indicate that the people of America—at least that part of America I represent—are minimizing this problem. Nor was it minimized, as we all know, in the report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which considered the subject not long ago. The

sum and substance of that report was that Cuba should have the No. 1 priority among our foreign relations problems, notwithstanding the many other serious and grave problems which this country faces in the international field.

Mr. ALLOTT. No matter what those of us on this side of the aisle could say, we could not make any stronger statement than that report, which seeks to impel the Government into a positive course of action with respect to Cuba. Does not the Senator agree with that?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes; there is no question about it. The report was made after a well-considered review of the testimony and evidence which was accumulated under the leadership of the conscientious, hardworking Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. He and his committee rendered a commendable service to the country.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend my distinguished colleague from Nebraska for presenting so forcefully his thoughts on this subject. Something has been said about the risk involved. Can the Senator think of any greater risk to the entire Western Hemisphere, any greater risk to the United States, than to continue to do nothing, and thus ignore the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere? Is there any greater risk than that?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct in ascribing to the situation the importance that he does. There is no greater risk than that. Let me cite a simple analogy.

Not so many years ago we found the same type of Soviet Operation Nibble at work in Europe. There were subversive efforts, economic pressures, even, of direct military pressures, here and there, along the borders of the various countries. There was only one answer to Operation Nibble: It was the creation, for that particular type of situation and those circumstances, of NATO—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO was designed for the purpose of preventing the biting off, chunk by chunk, of the territory, political integrity, and liberties of the people of Western Europe, to the point where complete domination would be reached.

We have the same type of operation in this hemisphere; and there is no greater menace than the one now facing us by reason of the illegal and revolutionary tactics being practiced in Latin American countries by Castro Communists and the Russian Communists based in Cuba. Mr. CURTIS. After all, if a building is on fire, although it can be said there is risk in having a fireman climb a ladder or in having a fire truck run through the streets, yet such risk is minimal when compared with the risk of letting the fire spread generally. We are faced with a similar situation as regards Cuba.

In connection with my colleague's valuable remarks, I should like to state that I hold in my hand a speech delivered by a very distinguished former Member of this body, Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, who formerly served as majority leader and also as

minority leader of the Senate. I wish to read several sentences from the speech:

Ninety miles from our shores there is a Soviet base in Cuba. We have had a vacillating policy relative to Castro. We have at one time or another encouraged him, tried to ignore him, entertained him, encouraged but failed to support an invasion against him, paid him ransom and tribute of millions of dollars in cash and supplies to release the Bay of Pigs prisoners; subverted our own judicial and legal processes by releasing Cuban criminals and gunmen in exchange for Americans held in Cuban prisons. In dealing with the Soviet base in Cuba we marched up the hill last October and since then have marched most of the way down again.

Mr. President, if my colleague will yield further, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, following his speech and the colloquy in connection with it, the speech delivered by Senator Knowland at the National Sheriffs' Association convention at Portland, Oreg., on July 15.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPEECH BY WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION, PORTLAND, OREG., MULTONOMAH HOTEL, 11 A.M., MONDAY, JULY 15, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Sheriffs' Association, last November I received your invitation to speak at this Portland convention. A great deal has happened, at home and abroad, since that time.

Like most small boys I considered sheriffs and locomotive engineers to be the tops in future occupational possibilities.

The change from steam locomotives to diesels modified my views of one and the substitution of prowl cars for horses lessened my enthusiasm for the other.

After 6 years in the legislature of my State of California and over 13 years in the Senate of the United States, 6 of which were as majority or minority leader I developed a deep-seated conviction that the real strength of our Nation is in local government of which your people are an integral part.

The men who founded this Republic were very wise. They knew the history of the world up to their time. They knew that where people had lost their freedom it was because of the concentration of power in the hands of a single individual in a nation's capital.

As a result the Constitutional Convention which met in Philadelphia in 1787 determined to guard future generations of Americans from tyrannical government. They did it by:

- (1) Making ours a Government of laws and not of men.
- (2) Providing that government was the servant and not the master of the people.
- (3) Dividing power in the Federal Government between three coequal branches as checks and balances one against the other.
- (4) By choice, making the Federal Government one of limited and specified powers and reserving all other powers to the States or to the people thereof.

They were still not satisfied that they had completely achieved their objective so in 1789 there were proposed and by 1791 the requisite number of States had ratified our first 10 amendments which we know as the "Bill of Rights" guaranteeing certain rights to the people which neither the Federal, State, nor local governments can take away from them.

Since that time we have amended our Constitution 23 times. To be sure this is, as it should be, a long and a difficult process.

We must never quietly permit the Constitution to be short circuited because some "whiz kid" decides that in this age of space travel and automation the American Constitution is antiquated or too cumbersome.

Neither executive fiat, judicial legislating or congressional resolving should change the basic frame of structure of our Government or the guaranteed constitutional rights of our people.

Civil rights are far more broad than racial rights alone.

These include the right to walk our streets day or night without danger to life, limb, or property; the right to own, manage, and dispose of property; the right to associate with friends of one's own choice; the right to have gainful employment and to stay or leave the job based upon one's own choice and judgment. These are also civil rights entitled to the protection of Federal, State, and local authorities.

Whenever a mob can deny these rights regardless of the composition of those who would take over the streets from their use by peaceful citizens and from the duly constituted civil authorities we have a breakdown of constitutional government.

It is too bad that those who have led the fight for one segment of civil rights have not equally stressed civil obligations and civil responsibilities.

Every American citizen has the right to register and vote according to the qualifications for voting established by each of our 50 States and to do this without having discriminating standards applied to the individual applicant or voter because of race, creed, sex, or color.

Every American citizen has a right to patronize or withhold his purchasing power according to the choice he and his family make in the marketplaces of the Nation.

By his political action and economic participation an opportunity is given to every citizen to have his say in influencing events now and over the future years.

But he has no right to ride roughshod over the constitutional rights of the rest of our citizens. No pressure group minority can impose by unconstitutional means its views upon the majority of our people without their consent. Changes can only be made through the constitutional process of amendment.

The American people are a just people, they are a patient people, they are an understanding people, and they are a law abiding people.

But if pushed too far (as King George III, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, and Tojo learned to their sorrow) they are capable of taking the necessary political or military steps to remove the dangers to their constitutional form of government. The ballot box can and will serve the majority as well as the minority.

The citizen who preaches civil obligations and responsibilities along with civil rights must practice what he preaches.

He cannot, as in the movie "High Noon," leave the problem of the bad men and gunmen to the lone law enforcement official. The attitude, too often prevalent among our people, "This is your problem, not mine" is not in keeping with American tradition.

Too often our newspapers, radio and television carry reports where the offender against the law has the moral if not the physical support of citizens as against the law officer carrying out his duty. The very least the officer has a right to expect is in the words of the early frontiersman "if you can't help me at least don't help the bear."

In this the press has a part of the responsibility. So do the sheriffs and police officers. The overwhelming number of law enforcement officers are dedicated men of integrity and courage. A few, a small percentage, from time to time betray their trust but so do a few bankers, political officials, news-

papermen or civic leaders. The rest should not have the tar brush of "guilt by association" applied in an indiscriminate way.

The first amendment to the Constitution reads as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

This constitutional guarantee of a free press was for the protection of the people not just for the protection of newspapermen.

I do not say to you that there are no arbitrary or unreasonable men in the fourth estate but I do say that the overwhelming majority of them are trying to discharge their obligation to keep the public informed about the news of the day—local, area, State, national, and international. They are working against deadlines where their mechanical problems make 5 or 15 minutes vital in making and edition. Returning a city editor's or a reporter's call 2 hours or an hour after receiving it can mean the public is not as informed as it should be.

Sometimes public officials on the national, State, and local level forget that they are public servants and that public business is the public's business. They classify as secret or confidential that which is not necessary to so classify by any legitimate security standards.

As one who has been both a public official and a newspaperman may I suggest that you invite your city editor, editor, and publisher down to your office to get a better understanding of your problems and that you in turn (if you have not already done so) visit your newspaper plant to learn more about the problems of publishing a metropolitan, suburban, or rural newspaper. I have found in life that, for the most part, the better we know a person the less difficult it is to deal with him. There are, of course, exceptions to the rule, but not many.

We have discussed some domestic problems. Now let us turn to the foreign field. Experience has taught you as law men that you cannot appease the criminal or the gangster. As in foreign affairs the road to appeasement is not the road to peace but in fact is only surrender on the installment plan.

In order to gain our independence the founders of our Republic pledged to each other "Our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

Ninety miles from our shores there is a Soviet base in Cuba.

We have had a vacillating policy relative to Castro.

We have at one time or another encouraged him, tried to ignore him, entertained him, encouraged but failed to support an invasion against him, paid him ransom and tribute of millions of dollars in cash and supplies to release the Bay of Pigs prisoners; subverted our own judicial and legal processes by releasing Cuban criminals and gunmen in exchange for Americans held in Cuban prisons.

In dealing with the Soviet base in Cuba we marched up the hill last October and since then have marched most of the way down again.

Last October the strong stand of the President which had the support of a united Congress, widespread public approval, the wholehearted support of our Latin American states and the backing of our NATO allies has been frittered away.

Khrushchev was not prepared for a showdown 90 miles from our bases and 5,000 miles from his. He may be in the future when his Cuban base is augmented by others.

Despite the Monroe Doctrine and a current expression from the American Congress that foreign bases and missiles in the Western Hemisphere would be contrary to our vital

national interests the Soviet Union challenged us in our own backyard.

During the October exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev the latter has suggested we get our missiles out of Turkey and Italy in exchange for his getting Soviet missiles out of Cuba. Our Government denies any "deal." But without advance consultation and agreement with our allied Italian and Turkish Governments we have taken our missiles out of those two countries.

Was it historic coincidence or was it a "deal" with Khrushchev? I don't know. Members of Congress of both parties have told me they don't know either.

During the Korean war the obstructionists to the winning of that war as advocated by General Douglas MacArthur said that our further involvement (bombing the Chinese Communist bases across the Yalu) would be fighting the wrong war, in the wrong place at the wrong time.

As a U.S. Senator I did not agree with that defeatist policy then and as a private citizen I do not agree with it now after 13 years of reflection upon those events.

American forces were required to fight with restrictions never before placed on our fighting men. They had to leave in the privileged sanctuary of north of the Yalu the bases from which Chinese Communist forces were attempting to decimate our divisions and shoot down our air power.

At that time (in 1950-52) we were in exclusive possession of the atomic weapon and an effective means of delivery.

We accepted what at best may be considered a stalemate because we wouldn't pursue the enemy to his lair or even to use a tight blockade to prevent petroleum products including aviation gasoline from getting to the enemy while we were suffering 160,000 casualties in Korea.

This didn't make sense to me then and it doesn't now. It was too high a price to pay for the good will of the neutralist states.

Mr. Nehru's neutralist views regarding Chinese Communists have changed some since the overrunning of Tibet and the invasion of India.

Mine, regarding Communists are the same as they were before, during and since the Korean war.

Even if one agrees that because of distance the Yalu bases where in the wrong place at the wrong time to meet the challenge to human freedom can anyone say that Cuba is the wrong place and October of 1962 was the wrong time?

Or have we become so much a captive of the "peace at any price" and "better red than dead" philosophy that we are prepared to surrender bit by bit and piece by piece at the constant "nibbling tactics" of the Soviet Union.

From that high point of last October where President Kennedy appeared to be functioning in the President Theodore Roosevelt tradition we have been brushing Castro's beard with a feather duster.

Last October we demanded the removal of the missiles and on the ground inspection to see that this was carried out.

Though history is replete with examples that the word of the Soviet Union is not worth the paper upon which it is given we backed down from our "on the ground" inspection requirement and took the word (without boarding their ships to inspect) of the Soviet Union that the canvas covered objects on deck were indeed all the missiles going back to the Soviet Union from Cuba. How naive can we be?

We did not insist on the immediate withdrawal from Cuba of all Soviet Armed Forces though these as well as the missiles were both there contrary to the Monroe Doctrine and the Rio Pact.

An Assistant Secretary of National Defense, Aruthr Sylvester, has enunciated the doc-

trine of the "right to lie" to the American people. He has not to this date been repudiated by either Secretary of Defense McNamara or by the President of the United States.

This is no "refusing to comment" or "declining to give out a release" on an inquiry by the press. The "right to lie" is deliberately misleading the American people.

The administration has not escaped the penalty of such a policy. Millions of Americans no longer know when they are being lied to and when they are being told the truth. I sincerely regret this is so, for if there is ever a need for a people to have confidence in the statements of the Government it is when we face the menace of international communism.

The only way confidence will be restored is for Assistant Secretary Sylvester to be removed from his job of "managing the news" of the Defense establishment and for his "right to lie" doctrine to be repudiated by both President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara. Anything less will insult the intelligence and continue to shake the confidence of the American people.

Senator KEN KEATING of New York has more accurate information on Cuban missile bases than the administration weeks in advance of October 22. At least the Defense Department was denying their existence until the President's speech to the country. Why? The Cubans knew the missiles were there for they had imported them. The Soviet Government knew they were there for they had supplied them.

Only the American people were deceived and they were the ones at whom they were aimed.

On Sunday, October 21, 1962, the newspapers reported that a Defense Department spokesman denied the cancellation of the trip of President Kennedy, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara had anything to do with the Cuban or Sino-Indian crisis.

Monday afternoon, October 22, 1962, the President discussed for the first time the proof of Soviet missile bases in Cuba.

Weeks earlier Members of the Senate and the House had pointed out that Soviet missile bases were in Cuba.

On September 17, 1962, at the Los Angeles Rotary Club, I said: "The buildup of a missile base in Cuba—90 miles from our shores—is a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine."

In April of this year President Kennedy in his press conference said that about 4,000 Soviet troops had been withdrawn from Cuba.

This still left from 12,000 to 13,000 Soviet troops in Cuba even if the 4,000 were a net withdrawal.

Senator KEATING states that approximately 3,000 to 4,000 have been sent to Cuba while the others were being withdrawn. These facts have also been released by a report released May 9 by the Senate Preparedness Committee.

I believe Senator KEATING and the Senate committee under Senator STENNIS have done a great service in giving the American people the whole picture on Cuban troop movements rather than just half the picture.

This administration after its less than half-hearted aid to the free Cubans at the time of the Bay of Pigs disaster when only air cover could have assured success of the venture has now withdrawn support from the Cuban exiles. Not only are they forbidden to use U.S. territory as a point of departure which is at least understandable from a point of view of international law but we go farther and along with the British intercept them when they depart from other countries and are on international waters.

It seems to me we are applying naval sanctions upon the wrong people.

Thirteen years ago we gave the Communists a sanctuary across the Yalu. Now we give both Cuban and Soviet Communists a sanctuary 90 miles from our shores.

This is not a partisan question. Not long

ago I spent several days in Washington. Democratic as well as Republican Members of the House and Senate are deeply troubled over Cuban policy or lack of one.

The answer one gets from the whiz kids whose advice finds its way to the President is: "Would you have this country invade Cuba and risk the danger of all-out war?"

They try to slam the door on congressional and public discussion while at the same time spoon feeding the public only what they want the public to know.

On this they will not be successful. A great debate is now underway at every crossroads, village, and town in America. It will spread until we will have an American policy that is sound and defensible.

Let me tell you what it will not be before I give you my views on what it should be.

(1) It will not pay extortion or permit the payment of ransom to any nation, Communist or otherwise.

(2) It will not torpedo the Monroe Doctrine as a basic cornerstone of American policy.

(3) It will not be founded upon lies, half truths or news blackouts in order to make it unknowable by the American people.

Recognizing that there are risks involved in any policy we follow other than complete surrender or appeasement which is a form of surrender on the installment plan I would be prepared to take whatever risks are involved for my country, for my family, and for myself.

Our general worldwide guideline to our State Department and to our Foreign Service should be:

The U.S. Government and the American people are dedicated to human freedom. What advances it we will support and what undermines or destroys it we will oppose.

In support of this general directive the Government of the United States will examine the facts and then take whatever steps our national interests require.

We shall neither feel required to telegraph our punches in advance nor will we establish privileged sanctuaries of operations for communism while communism is engaged in a worldwide conspiracy to destroy human freedom.

Now to the specific Cuban cancer.

(1) The President should proclaim that the Monroe Doctrine has been reestablished as a keystone of American policy in the Western Hemisphere.

(2) The President should address another private letter to Mr. Khrushchev stating that the continuation of Soviet forces in Cuba is in clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine and that in the interest of our mutual desire to maintain the peace of the world they should be withdrawn.

(3) If a completely satisfactory reply is not received by the President he should ask to speak to a joint session of the House and Senate. At this session he should ask the Congress for a joint resolution in support of the President to secure the removal of every Soviet soldier from Cuba. He should request legislation permitting the immediate recruitment, equipment and training of "Freedom Volunteers Corps." I believe many more Americans would make their contributions to such a corps than contributed to the blackmail ransom tax-free donations of last year.

If Khrushchev should be cooperative the President could offer to furnish sufficient U.S. transports and cargo vessels to return all troops and their equipment to the Soviet Union. If Khrushchev is not cooperative it should include:

(1) Joint action by all the Western Hemisphere countries (or as many as will cooperate) notifying the Soviet Union that if all such troops and their equipment is not out of Cuba by a stated date that all Soviet embassies will be closed and diplomatic relations will be suspended with the Soviet Union until such troops are withdrawn.

(2) The placing of U.S. air, naval and ground forces on an alert basis at least equal to that which existed in October of 1962.

(3) If the Soviet forces are not withdrawn by the date set pursuant to paragraph (1) a joint blockade (both sea and air) to cut off all shipments to Cuba except for food and medical supplies.

(4) If the Soviet forces are not fully withdrawn the U.S. should encourage the creation of a freedom volunteer corps (air and ground). This would be open to free Cubans, Hungarian freedom fighters, members of U.S. reserve units who could volunteer without losing their retirement or other rights, veterans of Polish, Czechoslovakian World War II forces, volunteers from trained units of free Chinese and free Korean forces, and any other experienced fighters who are prepared to strike a blow for freedom. The plane cover would be flown by experienced combat fliers like Chennault's Flying Tiger volunteers in China.

Since these would be volunteers and since the use of Chinese Communist volunteers at the time of the Korean war were not looked upon by the United Nations as being a *casus belli* by the Chinese Communist regime, we have ample precedent and quotable quotes for any who might feel called upon to object at the Security Council of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Such volunteers would be adequately equipped with air, ground, and naval forces to make decisive landings and/or feints simultaneously along the Cuban coasts.

Its international banner could be the torch of freedom that is held aloft from the Statue of Liberty and has been an inspiration to men and women who love freedom everywhere.

(5) Notice would be served that following the removal of Castro and the Soviet forces that a trusteeship would be established under the Organization of American States until free elections could be held by the Cuban people.

(6) U.S. ground, naval, or air forces would not be used unless the Soviet Union attempts to reinforce its garrison or commit a hostile act against the United States or its allies.

This I would call the progressive squeeze policy to offset the Communist nibbling process.

Of course risks are involved. But if the signers of the Declaration of Independence had not taken risks, we would not be here now. Risks have been taken throughout our history to gain, preserve, and protect our way of life.

The risk of doing nothing is, in my judgment, far greater to our ultimate survival.

To international communism the time is rapidly approaching, if indeed it has not already long since passed for the free world to say, "You have gone far enough." And for Americans to say, "Indeed you have gone too far when you have established your bases in Cuba 90 miles from our shores."

If we have no confidence in ourselves, no real devotion to our way of life, no determination to "pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" to maintain the freedom others provided, how can we hope to hand a free society to our children and grandchildren?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank my colleague, Mr. President. I am very grateful to him for the colloquy we have had this afternoon; and in that connection I also thank the Senator from Colorado.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PARLIAMENTARIANS FROM ETHIOPIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate is privileged today to have in the